

**INDEX TO  
EVIDENTIARY HEARING TRANSCRIPTS  
DORIAN HALL  
CROSS-EXAMINATION: PAGES 273-312  
RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION: PAGES 312-332**

**NO STANDARD FOR MITIGATION SPECIALISTS**

- NO ONE IN HER FIELD KNOWS, OR HAS STUDIED, PERCENTAGE OF LIFE  
VERDICTS V. DEATH WHEN THERE'S A PERFECT CASE OF MITIGATION ..... 279, LINE 1
- NO CHECKLIST FOR MITIGATION SPECIALISTS ..... 280, LINE 13
- ATTORNEYS MAKE THE ULTIMATE DECISION ..... 278, LINE 22
- NO MITIGATION SPECIALIST LICENSING ..... 283, LINE 21
- NO ACCREDITATION BODY FOR MITIGATION SPECIALISTS ..... 284, LINE 1
- NO FEDERAL ACCREDITATION BODY ..... 284, LINE 15
- NO ACCREDITATION BODY IN OHIO ..... 284, LINE 18
- NOT SURE OF STANDARDIZED PRACTICE FOR MITIGATION SPECIALISTS ..... 286, LINE 8
- DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S A PEER REVIEW; JUST PEOPLE MAKING  
COMMENTS ..... 322, LINE 19

**DIDN'T TALK WITH ANYONE CONNECTED WITH THE TRIAL**

- DIDN'T READ GUILT-PHASE TRANSCRIPT ..... 287, LINE 21
- DIDN'T READ ANY AFFIDAVITS OF FAMILY MEMBERS OTHER THAN  
THOSE IN POST-CONVICTION PETITION ..... 288, LINE 5
- DIDN'T TALK TO FAMILY MEMBERS ..... 288, LINE 11
- DIDN'T SPOKE TO GASTIL; ONLY READ AFFIDAVIT ..... 288, LINE 19
- DIDN'T TALK TO MARTHA JACOBY; ONLY READ AFFIDAVIT ..... 289, LINE 15
- HASN'T TALKED TO JACOBY TO THIS DAY ..... 294, LINE 23
- DOESN'T KNOW WHETHER DEFENSE TEAM WOULD HAVE LOVED TO  
MEET WITH JACOBY MORE OFTEN ..... 293, LINE 21
- DIDN'T TALK TO ANYONE CONNECTED WITH TRIAL ..... 290, LINE 8
- DIDN'T TALK TO ANGELO FEARS ..... 290, LINE 10
- DIDN'T TALK TO PANDILIDIS ..... 290, LINE 12
- DIDN'T TALK TO ROSENWALD ..... 290, LINE 14
- DIDN'T TALK TO SMALLDON ..... 290, LINE 16

- DIDN'T TALK TO ANY MITIGATION WITNESSES THAT TESTIFIED AT TRIAL.....290, LINE 20

**AGREES THAT MORE ISN'T ALWAYS BETTER**

- IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THE MORE ALCOHOL THE BETTER .....298, LINE 18
- DECISION DEPENDS ON THE TEAM..... 299, LINE 1
- IT'S NOT ALWAYS THE CASE THAT THE MORE DRUGS, THE MORE  
COCAINE, THE MORE HEROIN, THE MORE MARIJUANA, THE BETTER .....299, LINE 19
- "THERE'S NO REAL CUT-OFF POINT" AS TO HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH/TOO  
MUCH .....299, LINE 23
- CAN'T GIVE A RULE THAT SAYS YOU'VE ALWAYS GOT TO PRESENT  
THAT INFORMATION TO THE JURY ..... 301, LINE 2
- LOCATION OF CASE PLAYS A ROLE.....301, LINE 13
- NEED TO KNOW JURISDICTION YOU'RE TRYING IN ..... 321, LINE 2
- THAT'S AN ATTORNEY DECISION ..... 302, LINE 4
- THERE'S NOT A RULE THAT SAYS YOU ADMIT INFORMATION ABOUT A  
REAL BAD DAD ..... 303, LINE 1
- "YOU CAN'T THROW EVERYTHING IN." ..... 302, LINE 7
- "MORE IS NOT ALWAYS BETTER." .....302, LINE 23
- ULTIMATE ISSUE IS HOW THE CASE WOULD PLAY TO A JURY..... 308, LINE 7

**NO WAY TO DETERMINE IF ATTORNEY DID GOOD OR BAD JOB**

- SHE CAN'T CALL UPON ANY STUDIES TO SEE WHETHER AN ATTORNEY  
DID A GOOD JOB OR NOT .....280, LINE 23
- NO WAY OF STATISTICALLY ASSESSING WHETHER OR NOT THE  
ATTORNEY MADE A GOOD OR BAD DECISION ..... 305, LINE 3
- ANYBODY COULD LOOK AT A CASE AND SAY THEY SHOULD HAVE DONE  
THIS .....305, LINE 19
- EVERYBODY'S OPINION WOULD BE AS VALID OR INVALID AS HALL'S.....305, LINE 25
- "EVERYONE HAS THEIR OPINION" AS TO WHAT SHOULD BE USED AND  
WHAT'S BACKFIRING ON THE DEFENSE.....309, LINE 19
- IT'S POSSIBLE TO HAVE ONE SINGLE HEAD GO THROUGH THE  
EVALUATION PROCESS AND PRESENT A WINNING MITIGATION CASE .....312, LINE 19